THEOLOGY

VOL. LVIII OCTOBER, 1955 No. 424

Editorial

MANY readers of THEOLOGY will know and be grateful for the course of lectures delivered by Dr J. S. Whale in the University of Cambridge in 1940 that was published under the title *Christian Doctrine*. It is probably still the best introduction to the subject for well-educated inquirers. One of its virtues was that it drew upon the teaching of the great theologians of the Reformation period and showed that, if a Protestant is to be faithful to his tradition, he should hold a high doctrine of the Church as well as of the Person and Work of the Church's Lord. This was, however, only an incidental theme of the Cambridge lectures, and we wished at the time that we could hear more about it in a more appropriate context.

We were therefore disposed to welcome with a lively interest Dr Whale's new book which is entitled *The Protestant Tradition: an essay in interpretation*.[1] It is based on *two* courses of lectures delivered in the U.S.A., combined with other material—a circumstance that may explain the book's somewhat loose structure and uncertain consistency. It begins, very promisingly, with an assessment of Luther's genius and an exposition of his teaching. There follows a much shorter consideration of the character and work of Calvin. There continues to be so much ignorance and misunderstanding in England about both Luther and Calvin that what Dr Whale writes about them, which is warmly sympathetic but also wisely critical, will undoubtedly do much good. We will confess, however, that we found Père Bouyer's insight into the positive witness of the great Reformers in *Du Protestantisme à l'Église*[2] even more penetrating and persuasive.

The third section of Dr Whale's book, which is also comparatively brief, is devoted to "the Sect-Type" of Protestant thought, for which—naturally in view of his own roots in Independency—the author displays an enthusiasm that we do not find it easy to share, though we fancy some contemporary Anglicans who desiderate a tightening of church discipline will here be most inclined to applaud. Dr Whale is indeed aware of, and he points out, some of the weaknesses of "the gathered church" idea. But he is indignant with those divines like Bellarmine—and, he might have added, Hooker[3]—who define membership of the Church by baptism and outward profession of the faith. He fails to take into account the

---

[1] Cambridge University Press, 21s.

[2] See THEOLOGY, October 1954, pp. 361 f. We understand that an English translation of this book is being prepared and will be published in due course by Collins.

[3] See *Eccl. Pol.* III. i. 1-7.

difference between what God looks for in members of his Church and what men are capable of seeing or can be trusted to judge.

But the last section of the book, which is headed "Modern Issues", seems to us the least satisfactory. This contains three long chapters—on "The Roman Church and Toleration", on "The Totalitarian State and the Crown Rights of the Redeemer", and "Sectarian Division and the Oecumenical Movement". Much here is well said and with an engaging urbanity: but much also seems only remotely connected with "the Protestant tradition". We expected that the development of Lutheranism, Calvinism and the Sect-Type of Protestantism would be traced through the succeeding centuries to the present time. But instead we find ourselves wandering through a variety of contemporary questions laced with historical reflections. In the last paragraph of the book Dr Whale disarmingly remarks: "In skating so speedily over the thin ice of many a dogmatic controversy, the writer knows that he has raised many questions and answered none." That is, roughly speaking, true; at the same time, the matter is complicated by the fact that the answers Dr Whale appears to favour towards the end of his book seem to be more broadly based, more eirenic, more reconciling, less purely Protestant and, we may even add, more Anglican than what the reader has been led to expect in the earlier sections.

Perhaps we should not say "Anglican", since for whatever reason (it may be because he was lecturing in Texas and the Mid-West) Dr Whale scarcely mentions the Church of England nor has he any regard to the work of our classical divines. We do not take him to task for this omission, much as we should have liked to have his considered estimate of their theological methods. On the other hand, we must take him to task for his handling of Roman Catholicism. We do not much dissent from his conclusions about Rome's past record and official pronouncements with respect to religious liberty and political power,[1] but we do very much deplore his failure to acknowledge that there is now at work among Roman Catholics themselves a striking change of attitude and thought. It is surprising, for instance, that Dr Whale can discuss "The Roman Church and Toleration" without any allusion to such notable symposia as *Unité Chrétienne et Tolérance Religieuse* which was published in 1950[2] and *Tolérance et Communauté Humaine* which was published in 1952,[3] or to the important series of articles on the subject that have appeared in the American Roman Catholic periodicals *Thought* and *Theological Studies*. We are also astounded to discover that only one book by a Roman Catholic writer is included in the bibliography of *The Protestant Tradition*, viz. von Hügel's *Essays and Addresses, First Series*, and that this was

[1] Though we do not think that Dr Whale should say (p. 239) that "it is credibly reported by responsible journals that Protestant pastors have served long prison sentences in modern Spain merely because they are Protestant pastors" without saying where it is reported and by what responsible journals.

[2] See THEOLOGY, October 1950, pp. 399 f.

[3] See THEOLOGY, February 1954, pp. 41 f.

likewise the only book by a Roman Catholic that was included in the bibliography of *Christian Doctrine*! When Dr Whale publishes anything further in this field we hope he will show that he is acquainted with the writings of some contemporary Roman Catholic theologians, e.g. Karl Adam, Yves Congar, Louis Bouyer, Roger Aubert. If eirenic and reforming members of the different Christian communions do not even take the trouble to salute one another, there can be little hope of happier ecumenical relations or of a renewal of Christendom.

If we have thus expressed our disappointment with some aspects of Dr Whale's book, it is because we approach anything he writes with very high expectations.

* * * * *

The Durham University Journal for March 1955 (2s.) contained two long and interesting letters from the Newman archives at the Birmingham Oratory: both are addressed to Newman, one from Albany James Christie, the other from J. D. Dalgairns, written in 1844 and 1845 respectively. They are edited and annotated by Mr Louis Allen and should not be missed by amateurs of the tractarian movement.

* * * * *

We have sometimes thought of launching in THEOLOGY a campaign to stop the growing practice of referring in speech or in print to "The Rev. Smith" instead of to "The Rev. Albert Smith" or "The Rev. Mr Smith". We recently heard a B.B.C. announcer state that the part of "The Reverend Cole" in a broadcast of *The Dance* by Hugh Walpole was taken by so-and-so. Even *The Windsor, Slough and Eton Express*, which we are accustomed to regard as one of the most civilized of the provincial newspapers, not long ago reported that "after a short illness, the Rev. Peebles died on Sunday". But alas! we have come to the conclusion that it is too late in the night to do anything about it, since about the same time we received from a student in a theological college a letter containing an invitation to address a learned university society of which he was an officer. The letter began: "Dear Reverend Vidler."

The Character and Functions of a Non-professional Ministry

I. The Need in the Church of England for a Non-professional Ordained Ministry

THE seriousness of the present shortage of clergy in the C. of E. is widely recognized. The C. of E. has never really faced the situation created by the Industrial Revolution, and has never made effective contact with large areas of our modern society. The clergy shortage has accentuated this problem, while, to-day, traditional methods

seem to have little long-term effect. The small numbers of those connected with the Church, the comparative ineffectiveness of such laity as we do possess, indeed the shortage of the clergy itself, all these are indications of the need for a new approach.

It is generally agreed that the paramount need is for a new kind of laity—effective and missionary minded. But it is by no means so widely recognized that a new type of clergy is also required to meet the situation.

(a) *The Present Supply of Ordained Men cannot meet the Need.* We hear appeals for more clergy on all sides. This is nothing new in the life of the Church. In 1887, a motion was carried in Convocation especially drafted to meet "the overwhelming need of increase in the number of the ministry". Yet during the previous year, the number of men ordained in England was 757—a figure which has never been approached since that date! While last year the number of men ordained was 438. We are told that 600 men being ordained every year is the required minimum to-day. Yet apparently 757 was not sufficient when the population was fourteen millions less than it is to-day. *The truth is that the need for ordained men cannot be measured by arbitrary statistics; it springs not only from the necessity of staffing existing parishes, but also from the need to meet changing situations and to carry on the missionary work of the Church.*[1]

(b) *The New Kind of Layman Needs a new Kind of Priest.* Large areas of society to-day are a mission field for the Church. The key factor in this situation is, of course, the committed Christian layman. But ordained men of a new kind have an important part to play in discovering, calling out and training such laymen. Moreover, once groups of Christians are formed in any level of society, they must be provided with the full means of carrying on their life and witness, and of maintaining their contact with the life of the Church as a whole. *The Catholic Church has always held that the Priesthood and the Sacraments are essential to such life. A non-professional ordained ministry would meet this need, and ultimately, as in any mission field, it should come from such groups themselves.*

(c) *The Re-discovery of Sacramental Life in the Church of England is Endangered by the Shortage of Ordained Men.* Recent years have seen a remarkable growth within all sections of the C. of E. of a sense of the importance of the sacraments. But this has come at a time in the life of the Church when the numbers of those authorized to administer them has been seriously diminished. In practical terms, this means that an incumbent of a large parish with several churches may be forced to think either in terms of monthly celebrations of Holy Communion—an inadequate substitution for weekly breaking of bread—or of closing some centres. Yet a policy

[1] There are now signs of an increase. An estimate was given to the Church Assembly (June 1955) that about 700 men will be accepted for training for the Ministry in 1955. Such an increase does not affect the argument above, since it must be substantial and sustained before the ratio of clergy to population of 1887 is regained.

of centralization, with all its attractions, is not necessarily right in these conditions, and frequently leads to the abandonment of whole areas where there should be a centre of Christian witness. *The need is for many more Christian groups ministering to the area in which they are set. Yet any attempt to base such an expansionist policy on the right use of the sacraments is crippled by the shortage of men.* The use of non-professional ordained men would do much to meet this situation.

(d) *Urgently Needed Territorial Revision of Parishes is held up by the Shortage of Assistant Clergy.* It is obvious that the weakness of the Church and the shortage of full-time men requires a drastic reorganization of parishes on a territorial basis. This is true both in industrial and rural areas. Certainly, as has been stated above, we need more and not less "centres of Christian witness"; but it is highly questionable whether a large number of *separate parishes* (except in rural areas) are suited to the needs of our time. From most points of view large-scale amalgamations are essential to-day in our cities. Yet we are told that such reorganization is impossible to effect in many cases due to the difficulty of obtaining assistant clergy. This difficulty is unlikely to be resolved as long as the Church is thinking solely in terms of full-time ordained men; *but a recognition of the place of a non-professional ordained ministry in the life of the local church would open the way ahead.*

(e) *The Present Conception of the Professional Ministry is a* REAL *Barrier to a Sense of Ministry among Anglican Congregations.* On all sides it is recognized that these are hard days for the Church. All denominations have their difficulties, and some of these are accentuated by theological weaknesses not so apparent in times when large numbers were attached to organized churches. Some of the Free Churches, for instance, are now feeling their comparative neglect of sacramental teaching, and others of defective church order. The main weakness of the Church of England to-day lies in the failure of Anglican congregations to have a sense of mission or ministry to the world. The tendency is to leave the pastoral and missionary work of the Church to the men who are "paid to do the job". Such an outlook was seriously defective in an age when the supply of clergy was comparatively plentiful. To-day it is little short of disastrous. And the fact that the full-time clergy who direct parish policy are moving from place to place faster than ever before has accentuated the problem. *Can it be denied that this failure in a sense of ministry is in part due to the restriction of ordination*—which is, after all, the conferring of a pastoral and missionary commission of the whole Church—*to full-time professionals generally from another part of the country, and far too often from a different stratum of society?*

II. Are there any Objections to a Non-professional Ordained Ministry?

No theological objection to the practice of ordaining men still in secular employment can be deduced from *the Bible* itself. In fact,

the reverse is true. While St Paul tells us that "the labourer is worthy of his hire"—a reference to the full-time ministry always necessary in the life of the Church—he urges the local ministry of the Church at Ephesus to follow his example in labouring with their hands in order that they might by their work "support the weak; remember the words of the Lord Jesus how he said it is more blessed to give than to receive". In fact, both kinds of ordained ministry—professional and non-professional—are recognized in the N.T., and it was not considered unworthy, but, on the contrary, an excellent thing for the clergy of local congregations to support themselves and others by working with their hands.

In the Early Church the N.T. practice continued side by side with an increasing professionalism. It is not necessary to mention here all the factors which led to the restriction of ordination to full-time professionals. The growth of Christendom and the decline of civilization after the fall of Rome turned the clergy into leaders of both Church and state, while there was a plentiful supply of candidates for ordained life. The revival of education, etc., among laymen in the Middle Ages lost for the clergy their leadership in civil life (with exceptions such as in the field of education). This made a short step to professionalism. The New Testament practice was forgotten as the medieval canonists came to regularize the Church as it then was.

It goes without saying that the ideal of the full-time parson, well educated and with far more time to devote to prayer, Bible study, reading and pastoral work than that afforded to other men, has had a long and honourable history in the Church of England. There will always be a need for many such men as the nucleus of the ordained ministry.

But we conclude that there is no ground—theological or historical—for the restriction of ordination to full-time professionals.

III. Are there any Practical Objections?

(a) *Legal.* The position in regard both to Canon Law and the law of the land on this question is by no means clear. Some would maintain that they do not preclude the use of non-professional clergy, "either Priests or Deacons who may be serving the Church gratuitously in no actual definite office"—a judgment given by P. V. Smith, Chancellor of the Diocese of London in about 1920.[1] Others feel that this would present a difficulty, and that both the relevant canons and the law of the land should be changed. Suffice it to say that these laws were drawn up at a time of an abundance of professional clergy, and belong to an age long since passed. Those who drafted them did not intend such laws to keep the Church short of clergy.

[1] "A paper published in a Report of a Committee on the Extension of the Diaconate in the Diocese of London. The Report is not dated but it was probably presented in 1920, certainly before 1921."—Roland Allen: *The Case for Voluntary Clergy* (1930), p. 290.

(b) *Time.* One objection raised against the ordaining of men still in secular employment is that such men would find it difficult or impossible to carry out priestly functions while carrying on with their jobs. But this is based on a misunderstanding of the priestly life, identifying it with the life of a clergyman. The latter has to engage in many tasks which are not specifically priestly; and on the other hand, a man engaged in an industrial occupation may well be in as good a position for much of his time to exercise a priestly function.

It is obvious that the full-time professional should give all his time directly to the pastoral and missionary work of the Church; non-professional men would have far less time for direct work of this kind. But on the other hand, their contribution could be even more valuable to the life and witness of the Church in other directions, e.g. the fact that they are involved in society to a much greater degree, their witness at their work, and the opportunity to build up groups of Christians and to carry on the Christian mission there.

After all, most of the significant movements in modern society are carried on by devoted voluntary work: shop stewards, T.U. secretaries, political party organizers. The salaried official only comes in at a certain level.

And on this question of time, could it not also be added that the strain which many clergy feel to-day in endeavouring to minister to the population of large industrial parishes would certainly be lessened if this work was spread more widely, as would be the case if large numbers of non-professional men were ordained?

(c) *Secular Involvement.* It is argued that the priestly life means that a man should be set apart in one sense from the life of the world, and that consequently he should not undertake secular employment. St Paul does not appear to have shared this view. He makes it clear that the "apartness" of the priestly—*or the Christian*—life consists in "not being conformed to this world" whatever a man's function within it. In fact, this conception of the apartness of the priestly life is a comparatively modern innovation and, in part, a rationalization of the professionalism of the priesthood. *Certainly there is an apartness of the priestly life; but there is no reason for supposing that employment has anything to do with it.*

(d) *Control and Discipline.* It may be argued that the ordaining of men still in secular employment would be a first step towards the breaking away of groups from the organized Church and the formation of sects. There is a real fear among many Anglicans of any drift towards congregationalism. Certainly it must be admitted that the problem of control and discipline is always a difficult one in the life of the Church. But would the ordination of men still in secular employment accentuate that difficulty?

To answer this question effectively, one must look at the meaning of ordination to the priesthood. Seen from one point of view, it is the commission of the whole Church to a man to teach, preach, to administer the sacraments, and to lead. Surely this must strengthen

a man's allegiance to the organized Church rather than weaken it. And although there are obstacles from the point of view of the time available to such men, much of the effort at present put into the gathering together of the clergy in chapters, synods, groups, etc., could be given to non-professional men too, to the strengthening of the life of the Church.

The real danger of separatism comes from the growth of groups to whom the full marks of the Church are denied, or made too remote to be effective, and one of these marks is the ordained ministry. Finally, the best safeguard against separatism in the life of the Church is an episcopate numerous enough to exercise effective pastoral oversight of the life of their dioceses.

IV. The Functions of such an Ordained Ministry and Their Relation to the Full-time Ministry

(a) *In Parochial Life.* The key man in the parochial structure will naturally continue to be, at least in city parishes, the full-time incumbent. But the use of ordained non-professional men working with incumbents on their staffs would revolutionize parish policy and enable far more effective work to be done. For what is really needed in English parishes to-day is a vital and expanding policy with more groups of Christians, based on the regular breaking of bread. Yet, in many cases, we are pursuing a contracting and retreating policy—trying to persuade people to come to parish churches remote and in totally different areas from the places in which they live. Such an expanding policy can only be carried out in parishes where a large staff of ordained men is working. Since these cannot be provided from present sources, it seems hardly too much to claim that such a step would revolutionize the parochial structure of the Church.

(b) *In Other Levels of Society.* Until recently most of the thinking about the missionary task of the Church in modern society has been carried on in terms of the parish system. But there is a growing realization that the Church must penetrate all levels of society as we find it to-day, and in particular the field of industry. Here the ordained ministry has a vital part to play. We would instance the recent report on the Moral Rearmament Movement of the Social and Industrial Council of the Church Assembly, which states:

> "In view of the importance we attach to the formation and implementation of a national, co-ordinated and practicable policy, served by adequately trained man-power, we desire to say that we strongly support the growing volume of opinion which holds that the Church should recognize the necessity of a supplementary, non-parochial ministry to meet the demands and opportunities presented by the field of industry."

Such a ministry can be adequately produced only by the use of non-professional as well as full-time men.

The function of such non-professional ordained men would be to minister to groups at their places of work, to teach, to lead, and to administer the sacraments. Such a view of their ministry answers by its nature the question often raised as to why a Christian layman wouldn't do just as well.

Moreover, the traditional Anglican conception of the established Church ministering to the whole nation, which lies at the heart of the parochial policy, and which is also recognized by the provision of chaplaincies (e.g. Armed Forces, prisons, hospitals, etc.), should be carried over into a field where so many members of our society spend so much of their lives. The work of the non-professional ordained man in industry therefore should be seen as far wider than a ministry simply to a clique of Christians, but rather as a ministry to all those at his place of work, and indeed as having and stimulating a concern for the whole structure and conditions and problems of modern industry.

The point may be raised that difficulties would arise from the fact that the ministry of the Church would come to men and women both from the parochial field and from the field of industry. But such a conflict of jurisdiction (for such it might be termed) would be no different from that raised by the employment in industry of large numbers of full-time ordained men, the need for which is so widely recognized. It therefore falls outside the scope of this paper.

V. Could a Diaconate fulfil these Functions?

It will be obvious from the conception of the functions of the non-professional ordained ministry outlined above that no restoration of the diaconate could possibly fulfil the need. The real requirement is men who have the full symbol of leadership and service conferred upon them, and the authority to teach, preach and administer the sacraments. Nothing less will suffice. The restoration of the diaconate may well have a part to play as the Church adapts itself to the challenge of our times. But it is subsidiary to the need for more priests.

VI. What Sort of Men would be Encouraged to Offer Themselves for Ordination?

As we look around our congregations to-day, it may well appear that the kind of men suited for ordination are simply not available. Up to a point this may well be true, for the type of professionalism which has held sway in the Anglican Church for so long has stifled lay leadership. But far more men are capable of exercising responsibility of this kind than clergy are sometimes prepared to admit. The type of men needed are those who stand out in their own level of society.

Moreover, as soon as the principle of the ordination of non-professional priests was accepted, groups of Christians would tend to throw up their own natural leaders. The problem of selection would always be a difficult one, but it would be a great deal easier for bishops and their advisers to select for ordination men who had

proved themselves in their own sphere than selecting young and untried men, which is the task laid upon selection committees to-day.

However, it is worth emphasizing that since at the moment the whole conception of ordaining non-professional men is so strange to both clergy and laity in the C. of E., some kind of transition would be needed. This could be provided by the use of men trained under the present system at theological colleges, but prepared to work for their living after ordination. *It is well known that there are men already prepared to do this.* Their pioneering work could be the bridge to a new conception in the minds of clergy, laity and those outside the Church of the nature and function of the ordained man.

VII. What Kind of Training would be Required for Non-professional Men?

If large numbers of non-professional men were ordained, the need for a highly trained full-time clergy would be even greater than before. Theological colleges would certainly be of critical importance in the training of professional men. But it is highly questionable whether colleges as at present constituted are a necessary preliminary to the ordination of others. (It is of course well known that theological colleges are a comparatively modern innovation.) For these, something more on the lines of regular "night-school" over a long period with week-end courses would seem to be more appropriate. And such training would require from every diocese the best that it could possibly produce.

An effort would have to be made to carry over some of the best features in the present training of the clergy into that provided for non-professional men. Full-time clergy at the moment often have certain advantages over lay people, giving them a wider view; their training gives them opportunity for travel, for mixing on conferences with people from other lands and other denominations, and they often have experience of different parishes. It is certainly possible to transfer something of this to the training of non-professional men, and indeed it is already being done up to a point with many lay people in this diocese. Moreover, there are to-day suitable for the non-professional ministry men of experience and standing in their own sphere, travelled and with wide contacts; this will be as important in their ministry as adventures in the world-wide Church. Part of the refusal to trust the laity to-day comes from the fact that all too often we look at them as they are and not as they might be.

Conclusion

It would be a pity if the conclusion were drawn from this paper that its writers feel that the whole salvation of the C. of E. lies in the acceptance of the principle of a non-professional ordained ministry. The factors conditioning religious belief in this country are certainly not to be governed nor its problems solved merely by changes in church order. But the paper is written in the belief that the Church cannot any longer afford the refusal to face the challenge of a new

age in this field. If the survival of Anglicanism itself does not depend upon it, a change of heart on this issue would do much in enabling us to face realistically the tasks of our time. And such a change will recall to the Church an emphasis in the New Testament which should not have been forgotten.

S. Booth-Clibborn.
Michael Jackson.

Sheffield.

"Faithfulness" and "Faith"

This paper deals with a point which I have never seen discussed systematically; whether the word "faith", as St Paul uses it, carries a Hebrew rather than a Greek meaning. Thus in Rom. 3. 22 and several similar passages, we get the phrase *dia pisteōs Iesou Christou*, where R.V. and most commentators assume that *pistis* means what it means in our European languages, and translate "through faith in Jesus Christ"; this is intelligible enough, but it does not explain why in the immediately following words he repeats himself and says, "Unto all them that believe." A.V. translates "through faith of Jesus Christ", which is barely intelligible as it stands; but it would become clear at once if for the Greek *pistis* we were to read the Hebrew word *'emunah*, which in the O.T. is repeatedly used to mean "the Faithfulness of God". The phrase will then mean "the faithfulness of Jesus Christ", God's faithfulness revealed to him.

The discussion of the word "faith" raises for us to-day the whole problem of Christian faith in face of the prevalent scientific and secular humanism; this is a very living issue, and it is urgently necessary for the Biblical theologian to relate his studies to it, and not live in a world apart. This needs to be said by way of apology for a paper such as this, which is concerned solely with Biblical exegesis: to show how St Paul uses the word *pistis* on the basis of the new relation to God into which we have come through God's saving action in Christ. But it is necessary for us to get our exegesis right, and to know the Gospel that is committed to us.

(1) The Greek word *pistis* is defined by Liddell and Scott as denoting trust or confidence in persons and things; faithfulness and honesty in persons; pledges given as assurances of good faith; and *pisteuein* as denoting the putting of trust in a person or thing; believing that a statement is true; entrusting something to someone. Thus, in the ordinary epistemological use, we speak of certain knowledge that a thing is so; faith or belief, on good authority, that it is so; and opinion, when it is thought to be so, on less sure grounds. As

---

[1] Reprinted by permission of the Editors of the *Reformed Theological Review*, Melbourne, Victoria.

Dr Dodd says, "It would be true to say, by and large, that in Greek literature the intellectual element is the controlling one. *Pistis* in the gods is primarily belief that they exist, or belief in the veracity of their communications to men."[1] It was used in a religious sense by Socrates, and in the Hermetic literature it had a special connexion with the idea of revelation. But we do not get here anything like the Pauline and Johannine use of *pisteuein eis* of faith in God and in Christ (*ibidem*, p. 183).

Always in Christian usage it has been clear that "faith" means more than intellectual assent. With the scholastics, the formula for "justifying faith" is *fides caritate formata* (St Thomas Aquinas, S.T. IIa-IIae, iv. 3), cf. Gal. 5. 6, "faith working through love". On the Protestant side, there has always been a special concern to insist that faith involves above all a personal response of trust rather than a merely intellectual belief. But it remains that in all our European languages "faith" is seen as an act or activity of man.

(2) It is just at this point that the Hebrew meaning is sharply different; the verb *'aman* in its various forms, and *'emunah* and the other derivative nouns, have the fundamental meaning of "firmness", "steadfastness", "sureness"; and this applies above all to God, so that *'emunah*, faithfulness, becomes a divine attribute:

> "Thy loving-kindness, O LORD, is in the heavens;
> Thy faithfulness reacheth unto the skies;
> Thy righteousness is like the mountains of God;
> Thy judgments are a great deep.
> O LORD, thou preservest man and beast.
> How precious is thy loving-kindness, O God,
> And the children of men take refuge under the shadow of thy wings" (Ps. 36. 5-7).

As the psalmist implies, the Hebrew word denoting steadfastness and firmness applies properly to God and not to man, who is repeatedly characterized as physically frail ("All flesh is grass . . . the grass withereth, the flower fadeth, but the word of our God shall stand for ever"—Isa. 40. 6-8) and as morally unstable (as in the first four verses of Ps. 36, where ungodly man "flatters himself in his own eyes" and his words are "iniquity and deceit").

Hence the words "faith" and "to believe" (*he'emin*) do not properly describe a virtue or quality of man, in the sense that virtues such as prudence or courage are ascribed to him; they describe *man taking refuge from his own frailty and instability in God who is firm and steadfast*. So in Isa. 7. 9, the prophet says to the weak and timid king Ahaz, who is scared of the kings of Syria and northern Israel, "If ye will not believe, ye shall not be established"—if you will not make-yourselves-firm (on God), you will not be made-firm. Similarly Isa. 28. 16, which Dodd translates (*op. cit.* p. 183), "Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious stone of sure foundation; he who has constancy will not hurry distractedly to and fro." And Habbakuk 2. 4, "The just shall live in his faithfulness,"

[1] C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 179.

where the contrast is between the insolent self-assertion and boastfulness of the Chaldeans, which has been described at length in the previous chapter, and the steadfastness of the faithful Israelites who stand firm in their trust in God. The LXX reading is, however, "The just shall live by my faithfulness," *ek pisteōs mou.*[1]

(3) We come now to St Paul. At once we find the Hebrew *'emunah* reappearing in Rom. 3. 3: "Shall their want of faith (*apistia*) make ineffective the faithfulness (*pistis*) of God?"; on this rendering the commentators are agreed. Previously, in 1. 17, he has said, "In it [the Gospel] the righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith" (*ek pisteōs eis pistin*): what does this mean? The commentators mostly render the words "from faith to faith" as referring to the testimony to the Gospel given by one believing man to another (but St Paul is referring to God's own action in revealing his righteousness, not to man's testimony to it), or else as denoting degrees of human faith, a weaker faith leading on to a stronger faith. But is not the sentence much simpler and clearer if we can take it that he meant "from God's faithfulness to man's faith" whereby he is made-firm on God's steadfast firmness?

Similarly, St Paul uses the word *pistos* of God: God is faithful, who, having "called" the Corinthians, will "confirm" them to the end (1 Cor. 1. 8-9); who will not suffer them to be tempted beyond their power (1 Cor. 10. 13); "He who calls you is faithful, who will also do it" (1 Thess. 5. 24). In the same way he speaks of our Lord: "Faithful is the Lord, who will stablish you and keep you from the Evil one" (2 Thess. 3. 3). Outside St Paul, *pistos* is used of Christ in Heb. 2. 17, 3. 2, 1 John 1. 9, and very notably in the Apocalypse: He is "the faithful Witness' (Rev. 1. 5), "the Faithful and True" (19. 11); and in 3. 14 the connexion of these words with *'aman* is made clear: "These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true Witness, the Beginning of the creation of God."

The Hebrew *'aman* shows through very clearly in 2 Cor. 1. 18-20: "As God is faithful, our word towards you is not first Yes and then No"; for the Son of God, Jesus Christ is not Yes and No, but in him is the Yes; for all the promises of God are fulfilled in him, who is the Yes, "wherefore also through him is the Amen, to the glory of God through us. Now he who stablishes us (*ho bebaiōn*, he who makes us firm) with you, and who anointed us, is God." Gregory Dix gives us the right phrase for this passage: "Jesus, the Amen to the everlasting Yea of God."[2] Thus in Christ God's faithfulness is manifested, as in

[1] St Paul however does not quote it so, in Rom. 1. 17, presumably because the Rabbis would not acknowledge the LXX; and he seems to render it as "He who is righteous-by-faith shall live", as against their interpretation of "in his faithfulness" as meaning "by his works".

[2] In *The Shape of the Liturgy*, p. 130, where he is expounding the liturgical Amen, common to Jews and Christians. In the LXX it is nearly always translated *genoito*, "So be it", because the O.T. is looking forward to God's future Day of Grace. But for the Christian it is a mighty affirmation that in Christ God's promises are fulfilled. His Purpose is accomplished, and things prayed for according to his will are granted.—Hence we may say that it means much what Americans mean when they say "Sure!"; and we may recall the frequent "Amen I say unto you" of our Lord in the gospels.

him is manifested the righteousness of God, which in the O.T. is regularly linked with his activity in salvation, and God's *charis* or saving mercy, and God's love.

(4) It is true, of course, that St Paul very frequently uses *pistis* of human faith, and the verb *pisteuein* must always bear this meaning; thus he speaks of "the faith of Abraham" (Rom. 4. 14, 16), and of "your faith" (1 Cor. 15. 14, 17; 2 Cor. 1. 24), etc. But since he had the one word *pistis* for the two things, Divine faithfulness and human faith, it is in some cases quite hard to decide which of the two is chiefly in his mind. Which is it in Phil. 1. 27: "with one soul striving together for the faith of the Gospel"? Is it "for the sureness, the truth, of the Gospel", or "in belief in the Gospel"? And in 2 Thess. 2. 13: "God chose you for salvation in sanctification of the Spirit [*or*, of spirit] and faith of truth": is it "in the sureness of the truth" or "by believing in the truth"? Perhaps both meanings would be present to his mind. But there is a series of passages where we get a far better sense if we render *pistis* as the faithfulness of God manifested in Christ's human faithfulness, which we have seen already to be an authentic element in St Paul's thought.

Rom. 3. 21-25. Let me translate with comments. 21, "But now, apart from the Law, God's Righteousness [and Salvation] has been manifested [in the person of Jesus Christ], witnessed to by the Law and the Prophets; 22, God's righteousness, through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ, to all who believe"; (and now comes immediately the contrast with the frailty and instability of men) "for there is no distinction [between Jew and Gentile]; 23, for all have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God" (man was created to glorify God, and falls short of that glory by sinning); 24, "being justified freely by his saving mercy through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus" (made right with God, acquitted, liberated by the deliverance accomplished in the New Exodus); 25, "whom God set forth to be the Mercy-seat [the place of his atoning mercy] through divine faithfulness, in his blood" (his sacrifice for sin); "to show his righteousness" in that the sins of the past are not passed over, but are borne and atoned for; 26, that God might be shown to be "Righteous, and the Justifier of him who is of faith of Jesus". In this passage *pistis* occurs three times. To the last of these, in v. 26, we will return later. In v. 25, "through [our] faith in his blood" is an impossible rendering of the Greek, and it would introduce a reference to human faith in the middle of a set of three terms, the Mercy-seat, God's faithfulness, Christ's sacrifice. In v. 22, the phrase "to all who believe" would be redundant if *pistis* meant human faith. This same consideration applies in the two following passages.

Gal. 3. 22: "That the Promise through faithfulness of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe." We have noted already in commenting on 2 Cor. 1. 19-22 the connexion of *'aman* with the fulfilment of the promises.

Phil. 3. 9: "Not having a righteousness of my own, but that which is through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ, the righteousness which is from God *epi tē pistei*, for [human] faith."

Eph. 3. 12: "Through the faith of him" (A.V.); "Through our faith in him" (R.V.). But "faithfulness" plainly gives the better sense.

Col. 2. 12: "In whom ye were raised to life through the faithfulness of the working of God who raised him from the dead." No need to bring in a reference to man's response into a phrase which describes the Divine saving action.

Gal. 2. 16: "We, knowing that a man is not justified by works of the Law, but through the faithfulness of Christ Jesus [*dia pisteōs Christou Iesou*], we too believed in Christ Jesus, that we might be justified by the faithfulness of Christ [*ek pisteōs Christou*], and not by works of the Law"; and v. 20: "I have been crucified with Christ; but I live, no longer I, but Christ lives in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live in the faithfulness of the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me." If we are right, the words *en pistei tē tou Huiou tou Theou* are simply a variant of *en Christō*, the familiar "in Christ". In v. 16, however, we have also had another phrase, *ek pisteōs Christou*; and we cannot settle its meaning without considering the phrase which occurs several times as a description of Christians: *hoi ek pisteōs*. Why does he say "they that are of faith", or in Rom. 3. 26, "him who is of faith of Jesus"? Why does he not say simply "those who believe", as in Acts 2. 44?

(5) The point surely is that "they that are of faith" is a phrase corresponding to "they of the circumcision" and "they that are of the Law" (Rom. 4. 14) or "they that are of the works of the Law" (Gal. 3. 10); all these three phrases describe St Paul's Jewish adversaries, with the exception that "they of the circumcision" can also be used for Jewish Christians,[1] since *peritomē* denotes Jews as such.[2] Without the article, *ek pisteōs* (with a reminiscence of Habbakuk 2.4) and *ex ergōn nomou* occur often in Galatians and Romans as the rival grounds of justification.

More than once in Romans (notably in ch. 2 and 3. 1-6) we catch echoes of his many controversies with Jews in synagogues; and the way in which he uses these words seems to imply that they stood in

[1] Romans 3. 30; Col. 4. 11; Acts 10. 45, 11. 2. Romans 3. 30 is unintelligible as usually translated: "Who shall justify the circumcision by (*ek*) faith and the uncircumcision through (*dia*) faith." Truly a distinction without a difference! But surely, if *hok ek pisteōs* means "Christians" and *peritomē* means "Jews", the *peritomē ek pisteōs* is the Jewish Christians. What he is saying is that they and the gentile Christians are justified equally through faith.

[2] So in Gal. 2. 12, where "Peter drew back and separated himself, fearing them of the circumcision", the cause of his fear was the unbelieving Jews at Jerusalem. The messengers from James had brought word that the rumours of Jewish Christians at Antioch fraternising with Gentiles were putting the Palestinian Christians in danger from that quarter. Hence Peter and the others planned a "purely temporary" separation of Jews and Gentiles in Antioch at their Agape and Eucharist, till the trouble should blow over, without intending any sort of change of principle; this expedient would further avoid any demand for the circumcision of the Gentiles. St Paul called this "hypocrisy", or double-dealing; he would not have so described a surrender of principle; and his remonstrance with St Peter, Gal. 2. 14 ff., was an appeal to the principle that was common ground to them both. This is the brilliant exegesis of Gregory Dix in *Jew and Greek*, pp. 42-4, and it is of value in view of contemporary tendencies towards a partial revival of the error of F. C. Baur.

his mind as slogans or catch-words—"circumcision" as standing for the Jewish claim to acceptance by God on the ground of being his chosen people, and "works of the Law" on the ground of their fulfilment of their legal duty; and on St Paul's side "faith", the Christians being *hoi ek pisteōs*. What did he mean by this phrase? Was he putting up, in opposition to the Jewish claim, simply a personal attitude of "believing"? If this were all, he would have a singularly weak case, and one that would be open to all the criticisms of James 2. 14-26. Actually, what St Paul puts up to the Galatians is the Cross of Christ (Gal. 1. 4; 2. 20; 3. 1, 13; 6. 14), and the gift of the Spirit (3. 3, 5; 4. 6; 5. 16–25); the messianic promises have been fulfilled, the Christ has come; how then can they go back to the pre-messianic stage which has been left behind? In Romans, he grapples with the whole many-sided problem of man's salvation. He shows how Man is under sin, most of all when he seeks to save himself by meritorious observance of God's Law; but now, in the eschatological events of Christ's coming, God's righteousness has been manifested, first as his wrath against man's sin, and then as salvation. Christ has come to save, by uniting man to himself the Second Adam, and by suffering death for man's sin. Therefore, as Christ died, so man must die; the self-centred ego of the Old Adam in us all must be crucified with him and done to death; and as Christ rose from the dead, so man through baptism receives a share in his resurrection-life and the gift of the Spirit, whereby he is liberated from the selfish self and begins even now to live the new life which will be made complete at Christ's last Advent and in his eternal Kingdom.

Here is the work of God's righteousness, his faithfulness, his grace, his love; and it is all this that he opposes to the Jewish claim to justification by "circumcision" or by "works"; it is all this that is summed up in his phrase *ek pisteōs*. The *pistis* is primarily not man's act of "believing", but God's *'emunah*; and when man on his part "believes", what happens is that his frailty and instability are "made firm" on the solid ground of God's saving action. That is the Biblical meaning of "faith" regarded as an act or activity of man.

(6) We have been concerned in this paper with the Biblical meaning of faith, and the recurrence of that meaning in St Paul; and it does not fall within our subject to deal at length with his use of *pistis* as an act or activity of man, and of the verb *pisteuein*. A brief summary will suffice.

The pagan Greek meaning of faith was, as Dr Dodd told us, predominantly intellectual, concerned with "believing that" (e.g., that the gods exist) and not with "believing in" or "on", as the Christian believes in God. This phrase "to believe in" expresses the Biblical meaning of faith, as in Gal. 2. 16, quoted above, or Rom. 10. 14. But St Paul has also the intellectual aspect; for we cannot believe *in* Christ unless we know about him: "How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard" (Rom. 10. 14); and in Rom. 10. 9 the confession of faith is linked with believing "*that* God raised him from the dead". This use of the word raises no difficulty. It comes again in a number of interesting phrases, such as "the obedience of faith" (Rom. 1. 5),

"the household of faith" (Gal. 6. 10), "faith, hope and love" (1 Cor. 13. 13), "faith" contrasted with "sight" (2 Cor. 5. 7), "one Lord, one faith, one baptism" (Eph. 4. 5). In Gal. 5. 22 "faith" comes as the seventh in a list of ten virtues which together make up "the fruit of the Spirit" (here it seems to carry the O.T. meaning of "steadfastness"); and in 1 Cor. 12. 9 it is one of several gifts of the Spirit, being further defined in the next chapter (13. 2) as "faith such as to move mountains", with a reminiscence of our Lord's saying in Mark 11. 23, Matt. 17. 20. Such faith is there declared to be wholly worthless when treated as a human virtue, without the self-forgetfulness of love.

We may conclude with some words of Dr G. W. H. Lampe, from his paper in *The Doctrine of Justification by Faith* (Mowbray, 1954, p. 62):

"Faith is not a meritorious qualification for that Justification which is given 'freely by his grace'. Faith is the *leptikon organon*, the divinely given instrument by which man is enabled to apprehend the personal grace of God in Christ. Faith is not a human work. . . . In fact, however, the misunderstanding which sets faith itself in the category of meritorious works has bedevilled the history of theology to an extraordinary degree. It lies behind Bull's insistence that Justification is by a combination of faith with obedience, charity, and other virtues. It is the reason for William Law's contention: 'Suppose one man to rely on his own faith and another to rely on his own works, then the faith of the one and the works of the other are equally the same worthless filthy rags.' "

GABRIEL HEBERT, S.S.M.

Church and Ministry in the Thought of R. M. Benson

FATHER BENSON'S greatness as a spiritual director and a Religious founder is still generally recognized; his greatness as a theologian is not.[1] Nor is this surprising, for he produced no systematic works of theology. He said to the members of the Society which he founded, "we are not called to deal with theology in the way of massive learning, but we have to handle it effectively as a living power",[2] and these words apply very well to his own theological writing. It is scattered in volume after volume of Retreat Addresses, Meditations and Commentaries on Scripture. But just as we find no systematic treatise on theology set out in his writings, so we find no systematic description of methods of prayer, or of private spiritual experience. Fr Cary, S.S.J.E., has written on the former point, that we should "look in

[1] But see A. M. Ramsey, *The Resurrection of Christ*, p. 117, where Fr Benson's name is joined with that of Westcott as a great teacher of the nineteenth-century Church.

[2] R. M. Benson, *The Followers of the Lamb*, p. 13.

vain in his teaching for definitions of contemplation, whether infused or acquired, or for instruction on states of prayer", because "in the intense energy of his own spiritual life and its vivid immediacy, he was not concerned to pause in order to analyse and rationalise". We find no descriptions of private mystical states either, "for the simple reason", to quote Fr Cary again, "that the essential life of the Christian is fundamentally mystical, since it is the participation in the life of that fellowship which is the mystical Body of the Lord".[1] In the writings of Fr Benson spirituality and theology are fused together into a living unity, so that, as with the New Testament writers themselves, we are at a loss to know whether to describe him first as mystic or theologian.

The theology of such a man will necessarily be a theology which is constantly turned towards worship. "The use of intellect is", he writes, "that by knowing the things of God we may attain to the experimental knowledge of God's love. Otherwise our learning is only like a staircase leading to the top of a ruined tower."[2] Again he says, "others study so as to cavil. We study so as to worship."[3] The nineteenth century was perhaps more than our own a century of theological and ecclesiastical controversy. It is natural that Fr Benson should be very much alive to its dangers. The pupil and intimate friend of Pusey was not likely to sit lightly to Christian orthodoxy; but he knew that orthodoxy must be living and not merely abstract. "There is a great danger", he writes, "of valuing knowledge because we can put it to controversial account. The result is that controversial argument is apt to be shallow. Orthodox phrases are defended, when the orthodox meaning has been lost. And then, not infrequently, the old words come to embody false teachings."[4] How much there is here of the spirit of F. D. Maurice. And the resemblance comes out still more clearly in a sentence which may be taken to sum up Fr Benson's attitude towards theology. "We have not to maintain truth, but to live in truth so that it maintains us."[5]

From what has been said, it may appear to be worth while to examine the treatment which Fr Benson gives to one subject, controversial then and perhaps more controversial now, the relationship of the Apostolic Ministry to the Church. It must be emphasized that this article does not attempt to do more than outline Fr Benson's treatment of the question in the last two volumes of Meditations on the Passion and Resurrection of our Lord entitled *The Final Passover*, and is not intended to exhaust his discussion of the subject. The first thing that we must notice is how immediately his thought about the nature of the Church is controlled by, and dependent on his thought about the nature of Christ. Ecclesiology and Christology are inseparably connected, and this is why meditations on the Passion and Resurrection are full of references to the Church and its struc-

[1] R. M. Benson, *The Religious Vocation*, p. 27.
[2] R. M. Benson, *The Followers of the Lamb*, p. 10.
[3] Ibid., p. 13.
[4] Ibid., pp. 10-11.
[5] Ibid., p. 13.

ture. "Woe be to those who strip Christ of His glory," he writes, "not recognizing Him as the living Principle within the Church! The Church seems to them a mere web of worldliness that they may cut up according to their own fancy, taking various parts of the Christian scheme which may suit their tastes or their convenience, content to give up the rest, quite unaware of any hidden virtue of Christ."[1] Christ, the head of the Church, the centre and source of life within the Church, this is a reality present in his mind with an especial vividness; and this is why he is forced to exclaim against the modern development of the Papacy, which seemed to him to be trying to take the place of the Son of God. "Men may boast of the unity of compulsion or the unity of comprehension. Neither of them can retain the Divine Life within the Church. That unity of life can only be the result of the organism of the Body of Christ whereby all His people are gathered into one, having the Headship of His own Divine Personal Sovereignty acting through them all."[2]

But it is in the meditations on the Resurrection that the fullest account of the Church and its structure occurs. In the Introduction to this volume, Fr Benson writes, "The risen Body of Christ is not merely a pattern to which we must be morally conformed. It is an agent of spiritual power by whose operation the conformity is to be attained. Hence our conception of the risen Body of Christ will affect all our moral teaching. Our mode of approaching Him and recognizing His Presence in the holy Eucharist; our conception of what the Church of Christ should be, and of what is the importance of Church unity, . . . our thoughts respecting the faithful departed and our missionary enterprise, our belief in the spiritual efficacy of the sacraments, . . . all these and many other matters of theological importance depend for their answer upon our having a right apprehension of 'Jesus and the Resurrection'."[3]

The section which we are particularly to examine is called "The Corporate Endowment of the Church", and forms part of the meditation on St. John 20. 22. "And when he had said this he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost." "The gift which our Lord gave", Fr Benson writes, "was not given to any individual or individuals. It was given to the Church as a whole. The individual members received that gift as belonging to the communion of the saints. The solidarity of the gift in which all must share is what constitutes the unity of the Church."[4] This is the basis of all the subsequent exposition. "It is one Spirit which is given to all, and the presence of that Holy Spirit is the unifying principle of the Church . . . As the Persons of the Holy Trinity are one by the procession of Holy Ghost, so the Church is one by the inhabitation of the Holy Ghost. We are all individually 'built together for the habitation of God by this one Spirit' (Eph. 2. 22).

---

[1] R. M. Benson, *The Final Passover*, Vol. III, Pt. 2, p. 307.
[2] Ibid., p. 311.
[3] Ibid., Vol. IV, pp. vii-viii.
[4] Ibid., p. 503.

"We must not fail to notice two things. First, there were others of the disciples present when our Lord spoke these words as well as the Apostles. Secondly, St Thomas was absent, so that he received the gift not by our Lord's addressing him personally, but by reason of his official fellowship with the Church as abiding in corporate unity.

"This gift of the Holy Ghost was therefore a vivifying act of Divine Love, by which the whole Church sprang up into the life of the Divine Sonship and the participation of the mission of Christ. It did not constitute the Apostles into a separate caste, as if the Holy Ghost dwelt with them alone. The Apostles are not a mediatorial agency separate from Christ, whom they represent, or from the Church to which they minister. Christ is the personal mediator between God and man. He acts for God towards man. He also acts for man towards God. He is both God and man. The Apostles are an agency for communicating to His members the grace of His mediation, the joints and bands by whom the nourishment is ministered to maintain the life of the whole frame. The Holy Ghost did not come to the Church through the Apostles, but He came to the Apostles and to those who were holding fellowship with them as constituting one Church, one Body, all waiting together to be quickened by His communication. Clergy and laity constitute one undivided Church, the Body of Christ, having Christ for her only Head.

"In considering the power of the sacred ministry people are too apt to forget this, and to treat the stewardship of the Divine mysteries as if it were a stewardship of external goods entrusted by a departed master to certain delegated agents.

"The Apostolic stewardship is not an authority delegated by an absent Christ. It is an authority subordinately concurrent with His own. It is an organic ministration. The Apostles do not possess the life in themselves. That is the prerogative of Christ alone, the Head. They do not transmit mechanically as conduits, but vitally as functions of the Body of Christ. The life they have from Christ is shared by all around them.

"No order of men, however necessary to the vital action of the Church, can claim to absorb that vitality into themselves as solely their possession. The ministers of Christ distribute the gifts of Christ rather by a regulative than an intermediate or delegated power. Christ in His own Person acts through them."[1]

From this flows a whole theology of word and sacraments. "By the procession of the Holy Ghost who dwells throughout the Body, Christ is present, giving efficacy to the word of His servants, but the efficacy is due to the Personal agency of the Holy Ghost voluntarily co-operating with the Apostolic ministry, and giving effect to their ministrations by reason of the promises of the covenant made in Christ . . . The bare authority of the ministry does not supersede, although it distributes the presence of the Holy Ghost. The volition of Christ the Head is not suspended on behalf of the instrumentality of His members. The will of Christ and of the Holy Ghost is one un-

[1] R. M. Benson, *The Final Passover*, pp. 503-505.

divided Divine act. All His members have their life only while 'holding the Head' (Col. 2. 19). As He Himself says, 'Separated from me, ye can do nothing' (John 15. 2)."[1]

This does not mean to say that the Apostles have not their own proper office within the Body. The Christian Society does not cease to have an articulated structure, because it has received the Spirit of life. "The Holy Ghost found the company of the disciples possessed of an organized constitution and took possession of the whole. He did not come to each as a separate unit, but to all as one corporate society, and therefore to the office bearers of that society as the instruments of His unifying power.

"As Adam's body was first formed and then God breathed into it the breath of life, so the Apostolic Church was formed into a social organization by Christ before His death, and now the Life is received into all its parts by the Breath of the risen Lord.

"Christ is Himself the Head, and by this Breath He gives them life not only from Himself, but with Himself. He stands in the midst of them as He breathes upon them, and this Breath comes not as into the body of Adam from without, but from within. He is their Head, their Heart; their Life springs from Himself. His breathing on them is like the streaming forth of life-blood from the central organ of vitality. They are not called into life as a separate body by His creative power. They live because He lives and they are one with Him.

"The Headship of Christ, and the permanence of the Apostolic ministry, are thus the condition of the Holy Ghost's abiding work in the Church. He dwells not with individuals as separately self-sufficient, nor with the Church as a complete organization distinct from Christ, but the whole society of the faithful is partaker of Christ's Resurrection by this fellowship of the Spirit, that it may grow up into Him in all things, which is the Head as from Him it is fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth according to the effectual working in the measure of every part (Eph. 4. 15–16)."[2]

What has been quoted will be sufficient to show how very far Fr Benson is from setting the ministry over against the Church, and making the one dependent on the other; sufficient, too, to show his constant anxiety to demonstrate that the ministry and sacraments of the Church are, in Maurice's words, "representative" and not "vicarial", realizing Christ's presence in the Body through the power of the Spirit, and not substitutes for an absent Lord. At a time when much is spoken about "the Tractarian view" of the Church and ministry, it may at least be useful to see what one of the greatest of their disciples in fact says on this subject.

A. M. Allchin.

---

[1] R. M. Benson, *The Final Passover*, pp. 505-506. [2] Ibid., pp. 506-507.

Letter from Jerusalem

Palestine no longer exists. A small strip of coast in the south-west corner of what used to be Palestine is attached to Egypt. The rest of the country that bore that name is divided by a most unnatural line of demarcation passing through the city of Jerusalem, between the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan, which is an Arab state, and the state established by the Zionist movement, which has assumed the name of *Israel*. It is this name, with all that it has signified and still signifies, religiously and politically, which has given rise to the theological question about which I write. That question may be phrased, in popular terms, as follows: "How is it possble for Gentile Christians in the Near East to-day to bless the name of the Lord God of *Israel*?"

The immense majority of the indigenous Christians in the country which used to be called Palestine are Arabic-speaking. Some of them are descended from Arab tribes which had settled on both sides of the Jordan in the period of the Roman Empire and had become Christian before the rise of Islam. But probably more of them are descended from the Aramaic-speaking and Greek-speaking Christians who lived in Palestine before the Arabs conquered the country in the seventh century A.D. Among their remote ancestors there were certainly many Hebrews, as well as Greeks, Syrians, and others who were judaized in the days of the Maccabees and subsequently christianized. The Moslem Arabs of the country are also, to a great extent, of the same mixed descent, although some came from Arabia. Of the Christians, few indeed are converts from Islam or descendants of converts from Islam; they are a remnant that remained Christian through centuries during which the majority of the population was islamized.

These indigenous Christians and all other Christians in the Arab countries are troubled about the Old Testament. Many passages in the prophetic books appear to foretell the establishment of an ideal Israelite commonwealth in the former territories of the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah. Other passages, especially those dealing with the occupation of Canaan under Joshua, sound to Arab Christian ears like descriptions of the recent Arab-Jewish war written from the Jewish standpoint. The Arab compares himself with the Canaanite and the Jebusite.

Moreover, rightly or wrongly, the Arabs believe that the support given to Zionism by Christian countries in Europe and America was based, at least to a certain extent, on biblical grounds. For more than a century Protestant missionaries to the Jews have been working in the Near East. Many of these missionaries have stated, on biblical grounds, that when the Jews accept Jesus as their Messiah God will restore them to their ancient land. There has been a considerable amount of support for Zionism among Protestant clergy. There are still many Protestant missionaries to the Jews who hold firmly that

the "return" of the Jews and the establishment of their state are the beginning of a supernatural intervention in Jewish history which will eventually include the mass conversion of the Jews.

Fundamentalists of the millenarian type regard the "return" of the Jews as a sign of the approaching end of the age. But the sense of a biblical significance in Zionism is not confined to Fundamentalists. There are many who, as they meditate on Romans 11, come to the conviction that it contains a New Testament prophecy of the future "return" of the Jewish people to a special position in the Church of Christ and in the Kingdom of God. When such a belief is formed in the study of a theologian in the West, it may have little or no connexion in his mind with Zionism. But Zionism is such an important reality in the present-day life of the Jewish people everywhere, although some Jews are anti-Zionists, that when any thinking about the special position of the Jews comes under consideration its relation to the new political factor of Zionism has to be worked out. This is inevitable in the Near East. The Jewish convert in the Jewish state is anxious to declare that Christianity is the true Judaism and yearns for a Jewish Christian community. On the other hand the Arabic-speaking Christians and other Gentile Christians in the Near East inevitably answer the contention that the Christian Bible supports Zionism by saying that the Christian Church is the New Israel and that *all* the promises to the Israelites in the Bible must be spiritually interpreted as promises to the Church. In particular, the Arabic-speaking Christians feel bound to affirm that the Messianic Kingdom foretold *as if it was to be* in the former territories of Israel and Judah is *only* a mystical figure of the universal reign of Christ and has *no* literal connexion with any particular race or people or nation or country.

Hence at the Evanston Assembly of the World Council of Churches the delegates from the Near East opposed expressions in a proposed draft report which suggested that missions to the Jews were, on biblical and theological grounds, *more significant than* missions to the Gentiles. They felt bound to insist that, since the Ascension of Christ, all peoples are in *the* same relationship to him. This is not anti-Semitism in a new form. The Arabs are, in any case, Semites. It does not signify the refusal of Jewish converts to Christianity or of full support for the preaching of the Gospel *to the Jews and to all others.* Nor does it necessarily involve opposition to the *de facto* existence of the Jewish political state, if that state is regarded as similar in principle to all other states. What it signifies is permanent and uncompromising opposition to the idea that the Jewish people is *Israel,* in the religious senses of the word and means what we mean when we mention "Israel" in Christian prayers and hymns and bible-readings.

In practice, in the Arabic-speaking congregations of the Anglican Communion, the laity are very reluctant to hear lessons from the Old Testament. The Benedictus is not sung. Many people say that they cannot accept the inspiration of the Old Testament. Those who see the danger of this and combat it find it all the more necessary

to insist that nothing in the Bible, if correctly interpreted, supports the Zionist claims.

In the Jewish state Hebrew-speaking groups of Jewish Christians will no doubt develop in the course of time from their present small beginnings. The loyalty of the individual members of these groups to their new national state can be assumed without question. But it is surely essential to their Christianity that they should seek to be one in Christ with the other Christians living in the same area. The vast majority of the Christians now living in the Jewish state are Arabic-speaking.

The Jews themselves do not seem to believe that their return to their ancient land has come about as a fulfilment of Old Testament prophecies. The Orthodox Jews among them do not seem to wish to identify the community now growing with the Messianic Kingdom. One section of the Orthodox Jews regard the vague conception of a Jew underlying Zionism as utterly unsound and insist that no community can claim the name of Israel unless it imposes on all its members the duty of keeping the Mosaic Law. Although conversion to Christianity is regarded by non-practising and agnostic Jews, as well as by the Orthodox, as apostasy, so that attempts to form a Hebrew-Christian community are opposed and misunderstood, the Israeli state is, in most respects, a secular state. Those who hold firmly that it has a theological significance are waiting patiently for the future stages of the growth of a community which is still very much in the melting-pot. For the moment, Orthodoxy has great political influence through the recent influx of immigrants from countries in which "Reformed" Jews and "non-Religious" Jews are unknown. But whether the rising generation will be Orthodox or Humanists or will develop a new form of Judaism is another question. It is the missionaries and the Christian champions of Zionism, rather than the Jews, who are articulate about the miraculous character of the "return" which, to the Arab, means the displacement of 850,000 people.

The theological conception of the special position of the Jewish people is not free from very grave objections. The Jews are not a race. They include the descendants of innumerable proselytes, while the vast majority of the descendants of those Hebrews who became Christians at various periods of history are not regarded as belonging to the Jewish people at all. From a Zionist standpoint, anyone with a Jewish family background (who has not adopted a non-Jewish religion and thinks of himself as a Jew) is a Jew, whatever his attitude to the Mosaic Law may be. Christian theologians, when they think of the Jewish people, are thinking of those who now profess the Jewish faith and of Christian Jews who regard themselves as Jews. But are these modern Christian Jews, recently converted or children of the converts of modern times, to be regarded as "Abraham's seed", more than the descendants of the Palestinian Christians of the first century? Are not all Christians "Abraham's seed", independently of all considerations of racial or national origins? We may well recognize that the Jewish people has a religious genius, which is still mani-

festing itself. But that people has also a spirit of exclusiveness which still operates, even in those who pay little or no attention to their religious inheritance. It is true that biblical learning owes a great debt to the synagogue's preservation of Hebrew. Perhaps the most stimulating phenomenon in the Jewish state, to theologians, is the emergence of Hebrew as a language to be used in the everyday life of a modern people. But we must always remember that "God is no respecter of persons".

EDWARD EVERY.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. A. G. Hebert is a member of the Society of the Sacred Mission at St Michael's House, Crafers, S. Australia.

Mr Allchin is at Cuddesdon, and has written a thesis on the Revival of the Religious Life in the Church of England.

The Rev. Edward Every is a Canon of St George's Collegiate Church, Jerusalem.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE SACRIFICE OF PRAISE

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

Churchmen of all schools of thought should be grateful for Mr Couratin's sermon published in the August number of THEOLOGY. Since it is his hope that the conception of the eucharistic prayer which he outlines will not only commend itself to all Christians in the national Church, but will also help forward the cause of liturgical revision, there are three questions which I would like to ask. The first is addressed to the Evangelicals, the second to Mr Couratin himself, and the third to the Anglo-Catholics.

1. The Evangelicals tend to fight shy of any conception of the Eucharist as a God-ward action of the Church, however defined. For them it is primarily the occasion of the gift of God to man. They are of course prepared to recognize the "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" as an element in the Communion service, but they would relegate it to the post-Communion, identifying it with the thanksgiving for the reception of the Holy Communion as the response of the congregation to the divine gift. In support of their view they may allege the prayer of Oblation in its position since 1552. It is hazardous however to build up a theory of the eucharistic action on what is after all an Anglican anomaly. There is nothing corresponding to the post-Communion prayer of Oblation in any other rite, Catholic or Reformed. The question I would ask them is, Are they

prepared to abandon their insular attachment to 1662, and to reform their theology of the eucharistic action in a way which Scripture and the primitive Church so clearly demand?

2. If the Evangelicals will accept Mr Couratin's location of the "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" in the great eucharistic prayer itself, they will rightly ask for the recognition that the Eucharist is ultimately, if not primarily, the occasion of the divine gift and act in the Communion. Would Mr Couratin therefore agree that his great prayer of thanksgiving should pass on to petition, that God should give and act here and now in response to the Church's obedient offering of her thanksgiving? Such a movement from thanksgiving to petition would seem to be wholly consonant with the Biblical pattern of prayer, which almost invariably moves from a recital of God's mighty acts in the past to a petition that he should act in a corresponding way towards his people in the present (e.g., Acts 4. 24–28, recital, 29–30 petition, and 31, divine response).

3. Are Anglo-Catholics also prepared to rethink *their* conception of the eucharistic action? Quite rightly, they insist that this action is the Church's offering to God, but they wrongly conceive that action. First, for them there is the consecration, effected by the dominical words of institution, and then there is the offering of the consecrated elements—interpreted variously as the offering of the sacrifice of Calvary, the offering of Christ's Body and Blood, or the offering of Christ himself. If the Evangelical teaching is based on the post-reformation Prayer Book, the Anglo-Catholic view is based on the medieval interpretation of the Canon of the Mass. The pattern, consecration-oblation, however, would seem to have no support either from Biblical theology or from the teaching and liturgies of the primitive Church. Both seem rather to support the pattern, oblation-consecration.

The late Dom Gregory Dix maintained that it would be useless to proceed with liturgical revision until the Church of England made up her mind what she believed she did in the Eucharist. Mr Couratin's sermon opens up a line of thought which may help her to come to a common mind, and it is to facilitate this process that these questions are put to the main parties concerned.

Yours, etc.,
REGINALD H. FULLER.

ST DAVID'S COLLEGE,
LAMPETER.
5 *August* 1955.

FAITH IN THE HEALING MIRACLES

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

The Rev. Alan Shaw's important contribution to the subject of the nature of the faith of those whom our Lord healed (THEOLOGY, August 1955) should be of real value to those who take seriously the

Church's commission to heal the sick. Mr Shaw does seem, however, to be so anxious to remove the subjective element from faith that he does less than justice to one psychological factor which may be vital to the healing; namely fear.

If psychology has taught us nothing else it has surely demonstrated that fear is one of the chief, if not the chief, obstacle to that wholeness which we believe to be God's will for his children. There must be place for that "perfect love" of our Lord, however simple, which "casteth out fear". Our Lord's understanding of this can be adduced from the very stories the author quotes. "Be not afraid, only believe" is the message which certainly every priest who works in our crowded mental hospitals must carry on his lips.

The danger of the author's insistence that the faith needed is essentially in the Messiahship, rather than in the Person, of Jesus is that we lose sight of the equally important meaning of *pistis* as confidence and trust, which can be only in a person, and not a fact, however significant. The Bible commends both kinds of faith.

Yours faithfully,

KEITH A. ARNOLD.

CHURCH OF ST JOHN THE EVANGELIST,
EDINBURGH.

EAST AFRICAN LETTER

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

I was most interested in the Rev. F. B. Welbourn's East African Letter, which clarifies and adds to my own fleeting impression of a short visit to that area. But I think his footnote about the Archbishop of Canterbury's visit is misleading, when he says that it "was viewed with as much dislike by African politicians as that of the Queen last year". I do not think Mr Welbourn was in Kampala at the time of the consecration service; it was a most moving and significant occasion, and most of the leading members of the Baganda parliament—the Lukiko—were present. On the next day His Grace was received by the Lukiko in full session, and, after an address of welcome from the Katikiro, spoke in a friendly and conciliatory fashion about his hopes and theirs for a true understanding and settlement which would lead to the return of the Kabaka. These hopes are now to be fulfilled. I believe the Archbishop's visit and continued concern for good relations with the Baganda leaders have made a great impression and have largely dispelled fears expressed by some Africans earlier in the year.

I should add perhaps that I accompanied His Grace as chaplain throughout his African tour, and although we were fully aware of the tensions in Uganda the general attitude of Africans both leaders and people was extremely friendly.

Yours sincerely,

GILBERT BAKER.

BOOK REVIEWS

CONSCIENCE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. By C. A. Pierce. S.C.M. Press. 8s. 6d.

So little scholarly work in Christian Ethics appears in this country that No. 15 in the very useful *Studies in Biblical Theology* should be welcomed. In it the Chaplain of Magdalene College, Cambridge, presents the substance of a thesis which gained him the degree of B.D. of that University. It combines an austere linguistic study with the piquancy of a highly polemical purpose, and as it wishes to overthrow accepted ideas there is excitement in following the author through what appears at first to be tediously minute detail.

Basically Mr Pierce sets himself two tasks: (1) to establish in great detail the everyday meaning of *συνείδησις* in N.T. times and (2) to show that this is precisely the sense in which St Paul uses the word. There does not seem much doubt about the first of these tasks; the second remains very disputable. Mr Pierce demonstrates more thoroughly than ever that in colloquial Greek *συνείδησις* referred only to past acts and to culpable ones at that. That is to say it connotes a "pain" felt whenever the moral limits of man's nature are overstepped; it combines the roles of judge, prosecutor and hostile witness; and it produces a moral reflex action like dropping a red hot poker. It refers only to oneself and not to the actions and opinions of others. Furthermore its presence is so painful that its absence almost amounts to a pleasure (like the charwoman who said as she sat down, "Ain't it grand, nothing 'urts"). The absence of conscience, however, does not in fact mean that one is free from blame; one may in fact merely have done nothing (left undone what one ought to have done) or have deadened the pain of conscience. Not surprisingly Mr Pierce does not consider conscience in this sense a satisfactory guide in the Christian life.

This is obviously a very restricted view of conscience compared with that which has been dominant in the Christian tradition (though it accords closely with that of Brunner in *The Divine Imperative*), and which is current in books of Moral Theology (e.g. in Anglican terms, the works of Kirk and Mortimer). Mr Pierce is well aware of this. He holds the traditional catholic view, which came in via the Latin translation of *συνείδησις* by *conscientia*, to be just as unsatisfactory. It is broad, vague and formless; it exalts uninformed prejudices; it is an idol that replaces churchgoing among Englishmen; and the Church, by acquiescing in it, encourages them to assume that their opinions are infallible. This is the burden of Mr Pierce's concluding pages, in which wild generalizations so oddly succeed the previous cautious linguistic analysis.

Mr Pierce's case rests on St Paul's use of *συνείδησις*. In contrast to Moulton and Milligan, who say (*Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*) "the word would seem to have been 'baptised' by Paul into a new and deeper connotation", Mr Pierce holds that he disliked the word, that it was "the battle cry of the Corinthian trouble makers"

in writing to him, and that he took it up only to answer them in their own terms. His mature view of the word, however, is found in Romans (at 13. 5, not 2. 15), where Mr Pierce interprets it as the "internal" wrath of God. He gives a detailed exegesis of all relevant passages, and in each the word is given a bad sense; there is only one exception, 2 Cor. 1. 12 (not Romans 2. 15). He holds that in the discussion of food offered to idols the question is not that of a scrupulous conscience but of an under-sensitive and therefore defective one. Passing beyond St Paul, the exegesis of 1 Peter 3. 16 and 21 is that baptism turns a bad conscience into the mere negative of an empty one. Where one finds so much unconvincing it is a pleasure to note agreement on the treatment of the word in Hebrews. One cannot deal in detail here with the various texts; one can only say that it seems more plausible to hold that St Paul extended the meaning of the word and to interpret them in the wider and more traditional way. Another fairly recent Biblical analysis of the word (by C. Spicq in the *Revue Biblique* for 1938, which seems to have escaped Mr Pierce's notice) comes to very different conclusions about the same texts and holds that, drawing largely on his O.T. background, St Paul widened the use of the word and in doing so greatly enriched the idea of a person.

The whole discussion illustrates the truth of a recent remark by Bishop Stephen Neill (in his *Christian Faith Today*) that "nothing could be more dangerous, in Theology as elsewhere, than to base an argument solely on words". For although *συνείδησις* had this narrower connotation in everyday Greek, the wider ideas we have been accustomed to include in it—the capacity to weigh moral choices in advance, and to approve and not only to condemn them in retrospect—were present in Greek thought, and are pre-supposed in the O.T. and in the Gospels (though of course the term itself does not occur in either). It is indeed part of the fundamental experience of mankind, which St Paul aptly illuminates. The irony of Mr Pierce's study lies in the fact that, in spite of his polemic, he suddenly introduces at the end a new term, *προαίρεσις* to cover the element of choice which he has excluded from *συνείδησις*, and from the N.T. He then points out that they operate closely together and both require training. So we are back where we were!

One puzzling detail should be noted: we have carried the shorthand classifications PTI, NA, MPG, MB, MB Norm, MBA and MB Neg in our mind while reading, but on pp. 84 and 86 we meet another, MA, which is not explained.

University of Manchester. Ronald Preston.

One Body in Christ. By E. Best. S.P.C.K. 25s.

If the Lund Conference was right in suggesting that further progress in the doctrine of the Church is to be expected as we see it as an integral part of our doctrine of Christ, then any study that brings

the two together is to be welcomed. And Dr Best has provided an extremely valuable commentary upon that area of Pauline theology—on any showing the central area—which treats of the unity of Christians in Christ.

His method is patiently and carefully to work through the great words and passages giving expression to the concept underlying them all, that of the corporate personality of Christ.

He takes first the prepositional phrases "in", "with", "into" and "of" Christ. Here, as throughout, he gives a lucid and judicious assessment of the evidence. I should personally find it difficult to be as dogmatic as to say, in interpreting the phrase "in Christ", that "the *ἐν* must retain the same meaning throughout". Thus, to take but a single comparison, I cannot believe that in 1 Cor. 15. 19 ("If in this life only we have hoped in Christ") it means the same as in Phil. 2. 19 ("I hope in the Lord Jesus to send Timothy shortly to you") or that in either of these it carries the really characteristic Pauline idea of incorporation. Moreover, when he comes to *σύν*, he nowhere discusses the perplexing evidence that the Apostle seems to represent us as "in Christ" in this life and "with" him in the next.

But these are small points. The main part of the book is devoted to an examination of the terms the "Body" and "Bride" of Christ and the "Building" in Christ, and it brings together a great deal of useful and scholarly exegesis. The publishers' disclaimer, "not everyone will agree with the conclusions reached in this book", is, naturally, true, but hardly, I feel, demanded. It is presumably there to forestall criticism in certain quarters of his, now fashionable, rejection of the phrase "the extension of the incarnation" and of an ontological rather than metaphorical interpretation of "the Body of Christ" as applied to the Church. But the position he adopts is of a high reformed catholicism, which Biblical theology has now taught Anglicans to find no surprise to see coming from an Irish Presbyterian.

For myself, while fully agreeing that to say the Church *is* the Body of Christ gives no handle for applying indiscriminately to the Church all the attributes of an organism, I cannot believe that St Paul merely means that it is *like* a body ("The term is designed simply to suggest certain likenesses and no more (Dillistone)").

This interpretation carries us a long way. Where it seems to me to fail is that the language of "the body", unlike any of the other metaphors (and of course it *is* also a metaphor), is, when used of the Church, strictly an extension of the same language applied to the physical body of Christ, the glorified body, and the eucharistic body, and there is the closest possible theological connexion between them. Dr Best does not appear to do justice to this unique interrelation.

For instance, he rather surprisingly does not include "the body of Christ" among the phrases which bring out the unity between the present "inclusive" Christ and the Jesus who died and rose (185 f.). But a comparison of Col. 1. 21 f. with Eph. 2. 15 f. and, as I believe, further consideration of Rom. 7. 4 (not to mention the texts of baptismal incorporation) suggest that Paul saw in this term a vital link between the Incarnation and the Church.

Again, Dr Best finds no more than a verbal association, introducing an aside, in 1 Cor. 10. 16 f.: "The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the *body* of Christ? seeing that we, who are many, are one bread, one *body*: for we all partake of the one bread." But the Apostle is here clearly making some sort of causal connexion between Eucharist and Church (what suggests itself as the most likely translation: "*Because* there is one loaf, we, for all our multiplicity, are one body" is simply ignored), and this seems to be presupposed also in 1 Cor. 11. 29.

And, finally, Dr Best merely dismisses without discussion (100 f.) "the identity between Christ's glorified and mystical bodies", of which "as yet", he writes, "we have found no trace" (118 f.). I plead for a pondering of Eph. 1. 20–3 and 2. 6, whatever may be made of σωματικῶς in Col. 2. 9 f.

There are other points upon which one could engage—one wishes, for instance, that he had given even a little consideration to the relation of the Church to the Kingdom, which might have modified his correct, but perhaps one-sided, conclusion that in all this language of St Paul "the relationship of the Church to the world outside it is never discussed" (188). But this is a fine and compact piece of theological writing, which will be of real service to the thinking of the ecumenical Church.

CAMBRIDGE. J. A. T. ROBINSON.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE. By G. B. Caird. Studies in Theology. Duckworth. 10s. 6d.

Books treating of the Apostolic Age in general have not frequently appeared from the pen of English-speaking scholars. There have been translations of the famous German works of the later years of the last century (e.g. Weizsäcker's *Das apostolische Zeitalter*), but these have never acquired widespread popularity. The bias in favour of a more specialized "Commentary" approach given to English scholarship by Lightfoot has remained, and the most notable contribution to the study of the Apostolic Age from the English-speaking world in modern times is significantly in the form of the major study of *Acts* known as *The Beginnings of Christianity*. A new manageable book entitled *The Apostolic Age* is therefore an event of some importance, especially to teachers and students in theological colleges, who have to study the subject as a whole in the G.O.E.

This new Duckworth book will do something to fill a gap, and apart from one chapter to which we will return, will fill it very well. The difficulty confronting any writer on this subject is to decide in what proportions to handle a vast amount of material. There is not a word in the New Testament that is irrelevant, and all is therefore due for consideration. Gospels as well as Epistles have to be thought of, for they too emerged from the Apostolic Age. The political, social and religious background cannot be ignored. The theology of St Paul and the other leading writers must be dealt with. The historical se-

quence of events has to be worked out, and the connexion between the various phases discovered, or at least considered.

Dr Caird (New Testament Professor at McGill University) has tackled his problem in a workmanlike manner. His chapter on the Roman Empire is fresh and interesting. On the Jewish background there was less room for originality, as the material is more limited and familiar. He then gives three chapters on the First Christian Community, subdivided under the headings, The Gospel, The Spirit and The Way (all treated in the "modern" post-Hoskyns way, with much reliance on the work of C. H. Dodd). Then we find three chapters on the Gentile Mission, one on St Paul, and three final chapters on Consolidation, Christ and Caesar, and the Coming of the Lord. There is a useful appendix on Chronology (not going much further than Turner's article in Hastings' Dictionary, but containing a clear analysis of the inevitable problem of St Paul's visits to Jerusalem (Acts *v.* Galatians). A few documents (e.g. Pliny's letter to Trajan) are printed in full, as far as they are relevant.

The reviewer, who found the book very satisfactory in general, feels bound to raise a question about the chapter on The Period of Consolidation. Here Dr Caird allows himself to write as a Congregationalist, and he interprets all the available evidence, especially that on the emergence of the three-fold ministry, from a rigidly "Free Church" angle. Episcopacy is in his eyes purely an *ad hoc* arrangement, brought about to deal with the problem of the government in the second generation church. Now any honest scholar will admit that all the available evidence about the growth of Christian institutions leaves many gaps, and that the way they are filled will depend on predilections or prejudices. But it surely is important, in a book for students, to make a clear separation between the facts for which indisputable literary evidence is forthcoming, and those speculative guesses whereby the limited "facts" are worked up into a coherent pattern. This book will certainly be widely and profitably used in many Anglican colleges, but all should use this chapter with critical care. No doubt the amount of reinterpretation desired will vary greatly as for instance between Clifton and Cuddesdon, but careful discrimination between fact and theory will be needed in all.

RONALD LEICESTER.

FREE CHURCHMANSHIP IN ENGLAND: 1870–1940. By John W. Grant. Independent Press. 19s. 6d.

THE CONGREGATIONAL MINISTRY IN THE MODERN WORLD. Edited by H. Cunliffe-Jones. Independent Press. 8s. 6d.

If the test of a book's quality is irresistibility, then the book by Dr Grant is a very good book indeed. To me, it was more fascinating than any thriller. That may be because it records a history of the making of which I was a witness, and, to some extent, a participator. But to any reader, with the least interest in theology, this study of

Free Church history should prove to be eminently readable. It is smoothly written, well planned, and comprehensive.

The story opens in 1870, when the Free Churches (minus the Methodists) are seen to exhibit dynamic and confidence without a trace of inferiority complex. On their countenance is the rosy cast of serious theological thinking, as contrasted with a pallid cast, which betokens the absence of theological thinking, in a later period. In this first phase, the scene is dominated by men like Dale, Guinness Rogers and Radford Thomson, who wrestled with the great theological problems of the Church, Ministry and Sacraments. The Puritan theology of "The Gathered Church" determined Free Church thinking, that "the visible Church shall consist, as far as wisdom and vigilance can secure such a result, of those who are members of the Church invisible". In such a Church, the Sacraments were real means of grace, and the Ministry was a distinctive order, recognized by the Church as an order of men who had been *called*. Between 1870 and the end of the century, Free Church preachers were also theologians, not temperamental publicists.

From the close of this period until the revival of Reform theology in the early forties, the history of the Free Churches, theologically, is a veritable bathos, a swift descent from the sub-sublime to the super-ridiculous—with very rare exceptions. Of these exceptions, the giant example was Peter Taylor Forsyth, who towered as a Mont Blanc above a waste of depressing depressions. Instead of Dale and his Puritan inheritance, you had R. J. Campbell and his New Theology, a pulpy mess composed of decaying Hegelianism, half-baked Darwinism and frothy Utopian Socialism. This, in varying manifestations, was what passed for theology in the Free Churches between 1900 (*circa*) and the late thirties. Forsyth said of it: "The New Theology is like a bad photograph. It is under-developed and over-exposed." This description was a charitable under-statement.

This collapse of Biblical theology reflected itself in an incredible impoverishment of thought and worship, and in horizontal submission to "the world". To the state-established Church of England was added a Secularism-established Free Church, which emerged from the steamy foam of "the social gospel". The Last Supper was lost in Zwinglianism. The dissolution of a theology of the Sacraments showed itself in the introduction, in this period, of individual communion-crockery, tray upon tray of liqueur-sized glasses, which reminded a Congregational minister of "a doll's tea-party" (p. 166). At the end of this period, we find Free Church leaders, e.g., Albert Peel, seriously arguing that the Lord's Supper should be regarded as optional! 1900 to the thirties was the Great Theological Exile of the English Free Churches. It was an Exile that out-Babyloned Babylon. The outstanding significance of this period to the whole Catholic Church is its warning of the fatal, deadly consequences of theological neglect.

But the darkest hour is before the dawn. A new and a more than somewhat different Cyrus came to the rescue of the Free Churches in the person of Karl Barth, under whose influence men like N.

Micklem, John Whale, Bernard Manning, etc., led a revival of Reform theology. Once again the air in the Free Churches rings with challenge and the noise of creative battle. Once again a High Church doctrine begins to take shape. Congregations cease to be coteries and become Church. The Ministry ceases to be a secularized directorate, and begins to become Christ's apostolic gift to the Church. And so on and on. The Free Churches have become theologically serious.

Here, in bovrilized concentration, is the story told by Dr Grant. Read him and fill in the details. His book is more entertaining than Wilfred Pickles, more illuminating than many more pretentious histories, and more inspiring and encouraging in its conclusion than the fizziest champagne. Incidentally, it will remind any Anglican readers, who may be tempted to forget, that the Free Churches are still a vital element of Christ's Church. Bravo! Dr Grant. You've done a first-class job.

The second volume is partly, at least, a product of the theological revival. It stirs in me a personal interest, inasmuch as it is the work of men educated in the college (United College, Bradford) where I received my own theological training. The book is a symposium composed of contributions from various writers about the Congregational Ministry in the modern situation. The point to stress about all the contributors is that they are theologically motivated and determinded. Their outlook has been moulded by a Biblical theology, which they seek to apply, in this volume, to the conditions in which Congregational Ministers have to do their work to-day. They, in fact, have been made by the revival of Reform theology, which has characterized the last decade of Free Church life.

The Congregational theory of the Ministry is re-stated in the first section of the book, but modified by centralism. The denomination has now to confirm the individual "call", not the local Church. The implications of this admission are neither stated nor developed. But the pursuit of the implications would, I think, narrow the gap between the Anglican and the Congregational view. Forsyth has suggested this possibility in his *The Church and the Sacraments.*

The problems discussed in the second and third sections of the book are common to the Ministry of all the Churches—what, e.g., are the contributions to the work of the minister of the Old Testament, New Testament, and modern theology? In the third section, there are chapters on pastoralia, preaching, etc., which apply to the Anglican clergy just as much as Free Church ministers.

It will profit all ministers, and I commend it to readers. But Dr Grant's book is the one to fasten on. It's a block-buster of a book.

St Leonards-on-Sea. D. R. Davies.

The Call of the Cloister. By Peter F. Anson. S.P.C.K. 42s.

The fact that we should feel surprise at the publication by S.P.C.K. of a book by a Roman Catholic layman on the Anglican Religious Communities is an indication of our unpreparedness for that circula-

tion of mutual understanding and love which should characterize the relations of separated Christians. But if we feel an initial surprise it is soon turned into delight when we discover the sympathetic way in which Mr Anson handles his subject, the revival of the Religious Life in the Church of England during the last hundred years.

Mr Anson's book contains the history of every existing Anglican community, and also accounts of some which no longer exist. The author has amassed a great amount of information, for the most part very accurate, and presented it in a way that makes interesting reading out of what could easily have become a mere catalogue of names and dates. Anyone familiar with the only earlier attempt to write a complete history of this movement will be filled with admiration at the way in which Mr Anson has diversified and enlivened the accounts of the numerous communities he describes. A sharp eye for architectural detail, and a gift for capturing in a few sentences the atmosphere of a place, are great advantages in writing about institutions which often give much care and thought to their permanent houses. The merits of Victorian building are beginning to be more widely recognized, and the author is surely right in picking out the Convent at East Grinstead, built by Street for the sisterhood founded by J. M. Neale as "an example of Gothic Revival architecture which no other country in Europe can equal".

Mr Anson's method of describing each community separately has some disadvantages. It is difficult to assess the relative importance of different communities and easy to miss common factors between them. Furthermore, he has made what seems a serious mistake in putting the men's communities before the women's, although the latter preceded the former by twenty, or with the exception of Cowley, by fifty years. The result is that the first hundred pages of the book are mostly given to the description of various early but unsuccessful attempts to found communities for men, some important as Newman's, others less so as Nugee's. The author seems here to have sacrificed proportion to his taste for the picturesque. The life and example of Dr Pusey, and the unspectacular activities of the rapidly expanding sisterhoods, were in the long run of greater influence in the Church of England than the enthusiasms of Fr Ignatius.

And here a more general criticism must be ventured. On p. 59 Mr Anson remarks that Bishop Samuel Wilberforce showed a greater understanding of the fundamentals of Benedictine monasticism than did Fr Ignatius, who in the Bishop's words was "sacrificing the kernel to the shell". One could wish that Mr Anson had followed out this point at greater length; for, if it is true, it makes for considerable modification in the conventional Anglo-Catholic picture of hostile, uncomprehending Bishops repressing heroic rebels. The true "Catholics" in the Church of England were not surely Fr Nugee and the Order of Corporate Reunion, but men like W. J. Butler and T. T. Carter, who in founding their sisterhoods were prepared to sacrifice even desirable portions of "the shell" of the Religious Life for its kernel, and who consequently remained in close and friendly contact with their diocesan. It is due to the work of men of their type

that the communities to-day work as regular authorized bodies within the Church of England, and not merely as exotic Nonconformist agencies.

It is also perhaps unfortunate that Mr Anson has not told us more about the influence of Westcott, particularly strong in the foundation of Mirfield. In his sermon preached at Harrow School in 1867, and in an article in *The Contemporary Review* for April 1871, Westcott revealed a new and truly creative understanding of the Religious Life and its place in the nineteenth century. Many of the communities founded at the end of the century show traces, direct or indirect, of his vision.

Nevertheless, points of criticism must not blind us to the great value of this book. The author has undertaken a pioneer work in a field left shamefully neglected by Anglicans. He has put us all in his debt. Any idea that the lives of those who enter the Religious Life are dull and uniform should be dispelled by a reading of this book, which contains the story of such fascinating characters as the founder of the Order of St Paul, priest, trade unionist, champion of seamen's rights, and of the many Victorian women who defied all conventions, ecclesiastical and secular, in their desire to give themselves to the service of God and their fellows. Whether we regard the revival of the Religious Life in the Church of England as a remarkable phenomenon in the early history of women's emancipation, or as the most abiding work of the Oxford Movement, or as part of a general recovery in Western christendom of the full meaning of life in Christ, we shall be profoundly grateful to Mr Anson for writing this book.

A. M. Allchin.

King and Messiah. By Aage Bentzen. Lutterworth Press. 10s. 6d.

Selections from the Psalms. By Father Andrew. Mowbrays. 3s. 6d.

King and Messiah is a fascinating book, because in a few crisp chapters the complex of images underlying the "Messiah" is unravelled in a most suggestive and vivid way, and, further, because the author relegates his massive scholarship to the footnotes, leaving just a touch of the usual Scandinavian heat in the text. Translated with one important addition from *Messias, Moses-Redivivus, Menschensohn* (1948), the book, as well as the main discussion, provides a useful insight into the very considerable Scandinavian Old Testament study and, in the footnotes, a mine of references to that literature.

Basic to the discussion is the realization that Israel as a nation and people belongs to the Ancient Near Eastern cultural pattern, and although her desert-bred monotheism and her unique position as the first-born son, the peculiar treasure of the Yahweh, may modify that pattern, yet much valuable insight is gained by studying Israel's life and culture in the light of the pattern and of its main feature, the New Year Festival. Central to the festival was the king. He acts

for God and conquers the enemy. He acts for the people and gains salvation. He is the Saviour, the Redeemer.

Bentzen is concerned with the transformation in Israel of this office (Die Gestaltwandlung des Erlösers). First he proceeds to establish the existence of such a New Year Festival and such a king, and then to establish this mythological interpretation as primary to any definite historical setting. So for any enthronement, before any great battle, the images are drawn from the creation vocabulary of the festival. What happens now in history finds its significance in the events of the creation. What happens now in history is that the people "become contemporary" with these primeval, and saving events. So in dealing with the psalms or the other texts it is important first to set them within the framework of the myth and to see how the mythological background governs the understanding of the present history.

The figure of the king is seen to be very wide. He is a mighty God (the "little lower than God" of Psalm 8 is a "characteristic Israelite devaluation of the myth"), he is the primeval patriarch, the first man, and inasmuch as he stands for God and for his people, he is the Messiah. The author refers to Mowinkel's *He that shall come*, and against him insists on the relation between the divine king and the Son of Man. The all embracing idea of the patriarch from nomadic Israel absorbs the "King" ideology from the Canaanite culture pattern, and so the rhythmic view of history is exchanged for the linear. Then under the influence of the exile the great prophet of Babylon builds up a new myth. "The great events of history always had a tendency to become 'myths' in the religious perception of Israel. By 'myths' here I mean 'gospels', expressions of the revelation of the creative vital forces of God". He sees himself a new Moses leading a new Exodus, and in this way the title "his servants the prophets" and Moses' willingness to intercede and to suffer for Israel are absorbed into the image of the patriarch. Finally the image of the Messiah is taken from present history to the future hope in Daniel, where the vision in chapter seven is explained as "an eschatologized representation of the ancient Enthronement Festival".

So the strands are made ready, Royal Messiah, Moses-Redivivus, heavenly Son of Man. And in the faith of the Church the strands are found woven together in Christ; in him both the myth and the history find their meaning and their fulfilment.

This stimulating little book, by laying bare the anatomy of "Messiah", touches our present situation both as we seek to make real and lively the imagery and the intention of the Holy Communion, in which we become contemporary with the Saving events, and as we seek to build up a new myth for an urban and industrial society.

Father Andrew's book, written originally for the Provost and Chapter of Chelmsford Cathedral, is largely unaware of any of this discussion, but gives a useful list of psalms recited by famous men when dying.

SHEFFIELD. S. B. ROSIER.

THE LIFE OF SAINT LOUIS. By John of Joinville. Translated by René Hague from the Text edited by Natalis de Wailly.

THE MONGOL MISSION. Narratives and Letters of the Franciscan Missionaries in Mongolia and China in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries, edited and with an Introduction by Christopher Dawson.

The Makers of Christendom Series. Sheed and Ward. 1955. 18s. each.

By the thirteenth century the Crusades were accepted by Christians much as the missionary work of the Church was accepted in the nineteenth century. Most people had a cousin or an uncle who had taken the Cross, just as in our grandparents' time most middle-class families could boast of a relative who had helped to open up Africa, or had worked in India, or perhaps (if one were lucky) had been eaten by cannibals in Polynesia. But, as time went on, the crusading movement became increasingly sordid and commercialized. The old idealism of fighting for the cross and the holy places began to wear rather thin. As Steven Runciman says, "the Holy War was warped to become a tragic farce", "a vast fiasco". This was certainly true of the thirteenth century when this great and romantic movement had become almost as much a war against the Eastern Church as against the infidel.

The two redeeming features were the sincerity of St Louis of France, and the courage of the Franciscan friars, led by St Francis himself and afterwards by such gallant souls as Ramón Lull, the tertiary. These two books, which are now added to the "Makers of Christendom" series, show us the best side of the idealism out of which the crusading and missionary movement of the medieval Church sprang. John of Joinville's *Life of Saint Louis* is one of the great works of medieval biography and autobiography. A cousin of the saintly king, Joinville accompanied him on his journey to Egypt and Syria from 1249 onwards, and has given us a most vivid account of the actions, motives, thoughts, sufferings and day-to-day life of the royal party. In this excellent translation by René Hague it has a curiously modern ring about it, reminding one over and over again of the Crimean War, Mrs Duberley's *Diary*, and *The Reason Why*.

> My new servant told me that he had found me a lodging close to the baths so that I could wash from myself the filth and sweat I had brought from prison. That evening, when I was in the bath, my heart gave way and I fainted; and it was with difficulty that I was carried from the bath to bed. In the morning an old knight, by name my Lord Peter of Bourbonne, came to see me, and he was my security in the town for what I lacked of clothing and equipment.

This passage might easily have come from the diary of William Howard Russell, except that he would probably not have been able to obtain a bath. Like the Crimean books the whole thing is written from the point of view of the generals and the nobles, and shows us the curious mixture of courage and foolishness, zeal and indifference, nobility and dishonesty which seems to be a feature of all such enterprises. But through it all strides the majestic figure of St Louis, the

preudome, consistent in his goodness and courage, strengthening the faint hearts, caring for his men, reproving his officers, dispensing justice, enduring every kind of danger, disease, misery and horror with a pure and childlike faith that every victory was due to the intervention of God, and every defeat a just punishment for the sins of the crusaders. To this delightful translation are added a short introduction and five pertinent documents which help to complete the story of St Louis and his crusade. The only criticism that could be made is that the system of notes means a good deal of turning of pages which might possibly have been avoided.

The second book is edited by Christopher Dawson himself, and gives us the text of some of the travel-diaries and narratives of the Franciscan friars who opened up contact between the Western Church and the great Mongol Empire. Whereas Christendom was acutely conscious of the danger from Islam, it knew little or nothing of the much greater danger which threatened it from further east until Chingis Khan made his first great military sortie into Southern Russia in 1222. After this the whole pattern of Western strategy had to be reconsidered, so that by 1238 a suggestion was actually made of an alliance between Christians and Moslems against the Mongols as the common enemy of civilization. Such an alliance was never made; but attempts were made to open up diplomatic relations with the great Khans, the work being entrusted mainly to members of the mendicant orders. In this volume we have the texts of some of the accounts written by these intrepid and adventurous men—John of Piancarpino, William of Rubruk, John of Montecorvino and others—who endured almost unbelievable hardship in travelling overland through the steppes and across the Gobi desert in an attempt to plant the Christian Church in the centre of the Mongolian empire.

The first envoys were perhaps to be regarded as diplomats rather than as missionaries (though in the Middle Ages there was none of the hard-and-fast division between Church and State that we know to-day); but it was as a result of their labours and their sufferings that John of Montecorvino, as true a missionary as you could find, was able to establish a church, convent and school in the city of Peking, where we see him singing the offices with the little Chinese boys, some of whom he had bought in the slave-market, while the emperor himself strolled across from his palace to hear the plainchant.

> I have purchased by degrees forty boys of the sons of pagans, between seven and eleven years old, who as yet knew no religion. Here I baptised them and taught them Latin and our rite, and I wrote out for them about thirty psalters and hymnaries, and two breviaries by which eleven boys now know the office. And they keep choir and say office as in a convent whether I am there or not . . . And the Lord Emperor takes much delight in their singing.

The *Life of Saint Louis* and the texts in *The Mongol Mission* have already been known for some years in English translation; but it is good to have these new editions with the valuable notes and introductions which are here provided.

CHICHESTER. J. R. H. MOORMAN.

NOTE: In view of our East African correspondent's assertion, in the August number of THEOLOGY, that the Archbishop of Canterbury's visit to Buganda was viewed with dislike by African politicians, it seems well to recall that the Archbishop was in fact invited by the Great Lukiko, the parliament of the Buganda people, to attend a meeting of the Lukiko and that, when he did so, he received a speech of welcome. This was a quite unparalleled honour.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: D. D. Raphael, *Moral Judgement* (16s.).

BUDD AND GILLATT: F. W. B. Bullock, *A History of Training for the Ministry of the Church of England 1800-1874* (20s.).

CHURCH BOOK ROOM PRESS: Philip E. Hughes (Ed.), *Canon Law in the Church of England* (6s.).

COLDWELL: Father Basil Krivosheine, *The Ascetic and Theological Teaching of Gregory Palamas* [Reprint from *Eastern Churches Quarterly*] (5s.).

DOUBLEDAY (NEW YORK): Daniel Jenkins, *The Strangeness of the Church* ($2.95).

DUCKWORTH: F. E. Halliday, *The Legend of the Rood* (8s. 6d.).

EGEDE INSTITUTTET (NORWAY): Olav Guttorm Myklebust, *The Study of Missions in Theological Education*. Vol. I (N.Kr. 27.80).

EPWORTH PRESS: Mervyn Stockwood, *I Went to Moscow* (15s.); Leslie D. Weatherhead, *Over His Own Signature* (10s. 6d.).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: A. Graham Ikin, *New Concepts of Healing* (12s. 6d.).

INDEPENDENT PRESS: Nathaniel Micklem, *Papalism and Politics* [a series of articles in the *British Weekly* revised] (1s.).

LONGMANS: Paul A. Welsby, *Services and Prayers for Country Use* (4s.); E. L. Mascall, *Christ, the Christian, and the Church* [New impression: reviewed in THEOLOGY, April 1947, pp. 148 f.] (21s.); Margaret Cropper, *Sparks Among the Stubble* (12s. 6d.); Ancilla, *The Following Feet* (8s. 6d.); H. A. Blair, *A Creed before the Creeds* (16s.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: John Bright, *The Kingdom of God in Bible and Church* [reviewed in THEOLOGY, November 1954, pp. 431 f.] (30s.); Stephen Neill, *The Christian Character* (2s.); Emil Brunner, *The Great Invitation* [Sermons preached in Zürich] (15s.).

MOWBRAY: Henry de Candole, *The Christian Use of the Psalms* (6s.).

NELSON AND SONS: *The Revised Standard Version of the New Testament—Illustrated Edition* [on India paper with eight coloured plates, bound in rexine: will make an attractive gift] (12s. 6d.).

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PRESS: George Whitfield, *Philosophy and Religion* (6s. 6d.).

S.C.M. PRESS: H. Wheeler Robinson, *The Cross in the Old Testament* [a reprint in one volume of *The Cross of Job* (1916), *The Cross of the Servant* (1926), and *The Cross of Jeremiah* (1925)] (10s. 6d.); *The Evanston Report* [The complete official documentation of the Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches in August 1954: a work of reference which should be in all theological libraries] (25s.); Stuart B. Jackman, *But They Won't Lie Down* (5s.); H. A. Hodges, *The Pattern of Atonement* (8s. 6d.); Ethelbert Stauffer, *New Testament Theology* (25s.).

SHEED AND WARD: John M. Todd, *We Are Men* (7s. 6d.).

SOCIETY FOR OLD TESTAMENT STUDY: H. H. Rowley (Ed.), *Book List 1955* [recent books on O.T. subjects classified with short notices about each] (6s.).

S.P.C.K.: Freda Collins, *Put on the Armour of Light* (15s. 6d.); Michael Ramsey, *Charles Gore and Anglican Theology* [The Gore Lecture delivered in Westminster Abbey on 15 November 1954] (2s.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LTD.
GUILDFORD AND LONDON